1 evidence.) 2 is rejected. 26 It's 3 identified for the record, but your motion to offer it into evidence is denied and it's 4 5 rejected but it stays with the record. I checked the ruling 6 MS. WALLMAN: 7 naturally, Your Honor, but this was an attempt 8 to economize on what went into the record. I 9 appreciate the effort, but it's not the time to -- it's not the same thing. It's apples 10 11 and oranges. You're talking about taking 12 snippets of the document that you say that the 13 other side -- He's saying that the other side 14 issued to the public or something. The other 15 one was just his short-hand observation of 16 what's going on and that's different. 17 Twenty-six is out, but it stays 18 with the record. What's the next one? 19 MR. COHEN: Twenty-seven, Your 20 Honor, maybe falls into the reserved category. 21 This is some effort by Mr. Herring I assume to 22 read some other documents in the record and

1	make some point. There's going to be
2	testimony about Mojo's target audience. He
3	obviously doesn't have any first-hand
4	knowledge. He's I'm sorry, Your Honor.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm sorry. You
6	finish. Finish talking.
7	MR. COHEN: I was going to say,
8	Your Honor, that he's obviously not a
9	competent witness for this. He's read a Mojo
10	document and presented a table. So he's not
11	competent to testify. It's hearsay. He
12	doesn't have any personal knowledge of these
13	numbers. I mean if they want to try to put in
14	the Mojo document on cross examination or
15	through some other way they can.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let me hear from
17	Who wants to take this one? Mr. Feld.
18	MR. FELD: Thank you, Your Honor.
19	It was as Mr. Schonberg, I'm sorry.
20	MR. SCHONMAN: Schonman.
21	MR. FELD: Schonman said earlier.
22	This is offered on what is the basis of his

testimony. It summarizes the testimony. Ιt cites to the public document which he got this from and saying again it goes to giving the frame. It goes to when they were formulating the case. It goes to how do I know that these guys were same, were going after the same demographic that I did. there was an advertising supplement in which they put an ad in that said I'm going after this demographic and that's why I said they're going after my audience. It seems that it's no different from any of the other evidence that again is the basis of his decision as the president of the company saying that these guys are going after the same guys that I'm going after.

JUDGE SIPPEL: You know this is type of information that it could be agreed, if it could be stipulated, that it was that clear on its face that it would be stipulated. But I take it, Mr. Cohen, you're not prepared to do that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. COHEN: I don't think we're going to have a huge debate over Mojo's target audience. My concern is that I don't know if this is accurate. Here's my problem. They're documents in Mojo's -- That we've produced in discovery. We're not going to hear anything that Mojo said is great and we can adopt it.

We produced the document. He thinks it's a good document. He sticks it into a table. That's not the way evidence should work. But we'll try to stipulate to the Mojo demographic. I don't know whether it could be possible or not. Mr. Asch is going to testify about it. The experts are going to testify about it.

MR. MILLS: There will be testimony about Mojo's demographic and there will be opportunity to cross examine. The problem with this document is all the reasons, Your Honor, said that a press release might have some addition of reliability. This doesn't have that. This is coming out of some

1	unidentified advertising supplement to
2	Television Week and it is highly selected.
3	It's just the fact or snippet that
4	WealthTV decided to put in here. There is no
5	indication of reliability of this or context
6	and that's different than a press release.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. I've
8	heard enough.
9	MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, just
10	before you rule.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Ms. Wallman.
12	MS. WALLMAN: This is maybe a best
13	evidence issue here, but this comes with
14	something that put out by Mojo.
15	MR. FELD: They paid money to put
16	it in the magazine.
17	MR. MILLS: That sounds like
18	testimony. It doesn't make it inadmissible.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Why not put the
20	magazine in, offer the magazine? I mean not
21	the whole magazine but the page from the
22	magazine.

MR. MILLS: Cross examine the witness --

Mow if he read it right. I mean I don't mean to undercut Mr. Herring, but I'm saying I have no basis for relying on these numbers, the accuracy of the numbers. Numbers again they're depend than genreing if I can say that. This is very specific stuff and it's either right or wrong and I have no way of finding out unless you want me to go back and dig this up. I'm not going to do that to Television Week or whatever it.

I'm sorry. I don't want to sound that I'm trying to be disrespect to the material. I would certainly assume that it was done carefully and it's probably right. The problem is that it doesn't have the degree of reliability that I need to bring it in as a hearsay document. So I'm going to reject unless you can use it as the basis for getting an agreement, a stipulation.

1 I'm going to reject 27. I mean 2 this is not reserved. This is rejected under 3 the hearsay rule. 4 (Whereupon, the above-referred to 5 document marked for was 6 identification as WealthTV Exhibit 7 27, and rejected No. from 8 evidence.) 9 MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, I assume 10 that ruling, Your Honor, is not preclusive of 11 our using information like this or perhaps the 12 underlying advertising supplement on cross 13 examination. 14 JUDGE SIPPEL: On cross 15 examination, you're welcome to use, 16 anything like that. But bringing it in as a 17 direct exhibit at this stage of the case, I 18 would be look very askance at that just on 19 timeliness. But as a cross examine document, 20 absolutely, anything is open game. I mean I 21 would rule on it at that point if there's an 22 objection. But it is. It's still in the ball

park of cross examination.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Twenty-seven is identified and rejected as a WealthTV exhibit. Twenty-eight.

MR. COHEN: Twenty-eight,. Your Honor, it's hearsay and this is another good example of Mr. Herring as an expert because while it's not apparent from the face of this document Table 6, the third column, in Exhibit 28.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.

Egan's COHEN: That's Mr. MR. That's from our expert's table about table. here he has collected demographics. So information from our expert, two pieces. I'm not quite sure what the Mojo Viewer is or Mojo TV Week. I assume it's the document that we were talking about before and this is hearsay. It's not reliable and it's clearly expert material on its face since Table 6 comes from Mr. Egan's expert report as I understand it which is why it has redactions because Mr. Herring can see confidential, but not highly

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	confidential information as I understand it
2	under the protective order.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, who wants to
4	take that one? There's a lot of silence.
5	MR. ROSE: It's another summary of
6	an exhibit. It is their exhibit. I suppose
7	it's similar to 26 in that regard and he's
8	basically taking evidence that they've got on
9	some of their exhibits and summarizing it.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Again I can't even
11	tell from this exhibit where it's being taken
12	from. It's just out of air. I mean Mr. Cohen
13	realized Table 6. But I would never have a
14	clue what that is from. I'm going to reject
15	it on the same basis as 27.
16	(Whereupon, the above-referred to
17	document was marked for
18	identification as WealthTV Exhibit
19	No. 28, and rejected from
20	evidence.)
21	It's marked, identified, but it's
22	rejected for hearsay and for no indication of
I	1

reliability. Twenty-nine. 1 Twenty-nine, 2 MR. COHEN: Honor, we have problems with 29. Twenty-nine 3 which are two emails from Mr. Carstenson, one 4 is to Mr. Herring and one is to Mr. Turner. 5 Mr. Carstenson worked for Mr. Turner. Mr. 6 Turner who is going to testify as an expert 7 for Wealth was hired in 2008 for a period of 8 time of six months to be an advertising rep 9 10 for WealthTV. Mr. Carstenson is not going 11 business record οf testify. 12 It's not a 13 WealthTV. Ι can't cross examine Mr. 14 Carstenson because he's not here. Mr. Turner has already testified at his deposition that 15 he didn't go to any meetings. So he's not 16 17 going to help us. And then attached to that is a 18 presentation of Wealth's dated October 2007. 19 20 I don't know what's being represented. 21 it's being represented that this presentation 22 made Mr. Carstenson that's an was by.

internally inconsistent representation because 1 Mr. Carstenson and Mr. Turner did not begin 2 working from the testimony that we have for 3 Wealth until 2008. 4 So I don't have an objection to a 5 Wealth 2007 presentation. I don't know what's 6 intended by attaching it to this hearsay email 7 because there's nothing on the face of this 8 email that says that this presentation is an 9 attachment. So I just don't know why it's 10 here. But if Wealth wanted to separately this 11 GM presentation then Mr. Herring certainly can 12 13 sponsor it and they can testify to it. I need a JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. 14 response from WealthTV. 15 MR. ROSE: I believe the point of 16 17 putting these in is that he was representing this to the people he was hiring to represent 18 It's the kind οĒ 19 what his ad was. presentation he wanted made about his company. 20 This is the kind of position they were taking 21

in the market and what genre they are so to

1	speak, what audience they're appealing to.
2	There's a dispute here as to
3	whether they're seeking similar audiences as
4	Mojo and this is a record from his other
5	business of the kind of audience he was
6	seeking, what he was telling his admin to go
7	out and look for.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: So you're saying
9	it's business record. It's a WealthTV
10	business record, both of these documents.
11	There are two documents in the exhibit by the
12	way. At least my copy is.
13	MR. COHEN: Your Honor, I don't
14	see any reference in the email to the attached
15	
í	just to be clear.
16	just to be clear. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me get
16 17	
	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me get
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me get them started. I've got my question out there.
17 18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me get them started. I've got my question out there. MR. ROSE: I believe Mr. Herring
17 18 19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me get them started. I've got my question out there. MR. ROSE: I believe Mr. Herring will testify that these are records that there

1	testimony as I understand.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is it a fact that
3	these are both records, WealthTV records?
4	MR. ROSE: Certainly, they were
5	generated in the course of business. He was
6	telling his admin what to say and he was
7	sending him a presentation to say.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Let's see.
9	It's from Mr. Herring.
10	MR. COHEN: No, that's my problem,
11	Your Honor. It's from Mr. Carstenson.\
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm sorry. I'm
13	reading it from a different place. Which one
14	are you starting with because there are one,
15	two
16	MR. ROSE: There are two emails.
17	I was confused.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: There are two
19	emails and the pages are one, two and three.
20	So which page do we start with?
21	MR. COHEN: Is there a page one
22	that we're missing? That's an email from Mr.

1	Herring. I don't have an email from Mr.
2	Herring in this exhibit.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well
4	MR. ROSE: "It does look like his
5	name appears at the top of this but I can't
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: His name does
7	appear at the top as though it were. The
8	attachments are it says for itself what it is,
9	"Wealth on Wheels Interactive PPT." And it
LO	says more than that.
11	MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, I'm
12	advised that there is a page missing from this
13	exhibit to which I apologize.
L4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let's get
15	MR. COHEN: I think I now see it.
L6	I don't know if the Court has it.
L7	JUDGE SIPPEL: What is it? What
18	page would it be? I've got three pages.
19	MR. COHEN: Three pages of emails?
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
21	MR. COHEN: I only have two pages.
22	The first page that Mr. Harding just gave me

1 the bottom part of the page is an email from 2 Mr. Herring to Larry, IDriveSales. So that 3 must be Mr. Carstenson. 4 So we would not object to the 5 piece of this email chain if Mr. Herring is That's perfectly 6 just sending an email. 7 appropriate. The emails, the two emails, that 8 appear to follow, both of which are from Mr. 9 Carstenson, are hearsay and that hearsay is 10 not overcome by the business record exception 11 because they're not his documents. They're 12 documents created by IdriveSales. 13 I don't think -- And then 14 email says he attaches two PowerPoints and 15 there's only one PowerPoint attached. So 16 there's a completeness problem as well. 17 MR. MILLS: And that's the email 18 that came three months later that was said it 19 looks like -- The attachment didn't appear 20 until March 27, 2009 at the very top of the 21 first page. That's where the attachments

and that's

just

to

first

appeared

22

Tim

1	Robertson and doesn't appear to be related to
2	Charles Herring's email at the bottom of page
3	one.
4	MR. COHEN: This looks-like a
5	document, you just can't tell on its face,
6	that it's internally inconsistent document in
7	addition to the hearsay.
8	MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, we tried
9	to present complete exhibits and I apologize
10	that the first page appears to be missing from
11	some versions. Tim Robertson is an IT type
12	person in the company. His name may appear at
13	the top of that page because he helped produce
14	the document. There are in fact two
15	PowerPoints decks. The second PowerPoint deck
16	begins at 11.
17	MR. COHEN: Eleven. Oh, over
18	here. I apologize. I do have two. I
19	apologize. I didn't see that.
20	MS. WALLMAN: That's okay. Twelve
21	in the numbers.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Eleven. I'm sorry.

1	MS. WALLMAN: It may be 12 in your
2	version, Your Honor.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Are you talking
4	about tabs?
5	MS. WALLMAN: No, Your Honor. I'm
6	talking about the internal numeration of
7	Exhibit 29. If you turn to page 12 of the
8	exhibit, you'll see a second introductory
9	slide, WealthTV.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm sorry. I see.
11	MS. WALLMAN: I'm trying to
12	respond to some of the things that Mr. Cohen.
13	There are in fact two attachments, two
14	PowerPoints, to this.
15	MR. COHEN: I acknowledge that.
16	MR. MILLS: In mine, it's page 13.
17	That's the beginning of the sentence.
18	MS. WALLMAN: Yes.
19	MR. MILLS: Page 13.
20	MS. WALLMAN: Yes, and we're
21	trying to present a complete picture here of
22	what the exchange was between the company and

1	the They were asking them to represent
2	them to advertisers. We're not relying on the
3	truth of anything represented here in Mr.
4	Carstenson's statement.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's Carstenson?
6	MS. WALLMAN: Carstenson is the
7	name of the man.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Carstenson. Make
9	sure the reporter has that. That's a tricky
10	name. Carstenson.
11	MS. WALLMAN: Yes.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Actually that's
13	Norwegian. Anyway.
14	MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, you'll
15	see as the testimony develops in this trial
16	there are issues about what the advertising
17	people were told to say about WealthTV and
18	this is an important exhibit to us because it,
19	with the proper first page on top, indicates
20	what the company was telling Wealth and
21	telling people to say about WealthTV in
22	pitching advertising sales.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. It's an
2	internal document then from WealthTV.
3	MS. WALLMAN: Correct.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: And it is complete
5	because you have I would miss the fact that
6	it's got the photocopies of the slides and all
7	that PowerPoint material. Go ahead, Mr.
8	Cohen.
9	MR. COHEN: Your Honor, I think I
10	see Mr. Mills' point now that I see the whole
11	document. Do you have on the top of your
12	Charles Herring to Tim Robertson dated March
13	27, 2009? Is that the first page of the
14	exhibit that you have?
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: The first page that
16	I have At the very top of the first page?
17	MR. COHEN: Yes, the very top of
18	the first page.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: It says, "From
20	Charles Herring to Tim Robertson."
21	MR. COHEN: Right, and I think
22	that the problem that we're having is that has

1	an attachment of these two PowerPoints.
2	That's in March. The correspondence March
3	of '09. The correspondence between Mr.
4	Herring and Mr. Carstenson is in the first
5	quarter of '08.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, I see that.
7	MR. MILLS: There are no
8	attachments referenced.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: I see that. It
10	looks like it was cut and pasted.
11	MR. COHEN: Well, it says, "I have
12	attached two PowerPoint presentations," but
13	there's nothing in this document that tells
14	that those are the two that were attached.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: I see what you're
16	saying. It looks like it was cut and pasted
17	or something.
18	MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, Mr.
19	Herring will testify that these attachments
20	were attachments to his email.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Which email are you
22	talking about?

1	MS. WALLMAN: I'm talking about
2	his outbound email.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. His
4	outbound email. Is that the one that's dated
5	March 27 to Mr. Robertson?
6	MS. WALLMAN: I'm disadvantaged.
7	May I look at that please?
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Or the one that's
9	dated 2008 from Charles Herring to Larry
10	IdriveSales.net?
11	MS. WALLMAN: Yes, the January 25,
12	2008 and the material above that is an
13	artifact of the way in which the document was
14	obtained from the company files and produced.
15	MR. MILLS: Your Honor, the
16	question I have about that, I understand how
17	it came out through the IT Department and how
18	it was printed. But usually you see either a
19	line that says attachments or sometimes you
20	see an icon that shows an attachment was
21	there. I see the line that says attachments
22	from March '09, but I don't see And I know

1 there's a reference to attachments. 2 don't see anything that says attachments in 3 the 2008 email chain and no icons. Ι understand 4 So while 5 somebody at some later point felt that these 6 were the two attachments that must have been 7 or they thought were attached to those earlier 8 emails. We don't know that. 9 MR. ROSE: But Mr. Herring is 1.0 going to testify about the nature of his email 11 and to show that he's telling me it was 12 attached. I'm --13 This is not a case of MR. FELD: 14 hearsay because the witness is here and will 15 verify the document. 16 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, all right. 17 Aside from this problem with the chain of 18 custody almost kind of evidence here the 19 substantive story that it tells with respect 20 to the PowerPoint slides and all that, is 21 there any objection to that in terms 22 relevance?

1	MR. COHEN: The PowerPoints
2	themselves, no, Your Honor.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well,
4	let's try and straighten this thing out. I'll
5	allow it to come in subject to Mr. Herring
6	satisfying me that this chain of emails are
7	what they purport to be, that you say they
8	purport to be.
9	(Whereupon, the above-referred to
10	document was marked for
11	identification as WealthTV Exhibit
12	No. 29, and received in evidence.)
13	And there will be an opportunity
14	to voir dire him or however you want to get at
15	it, Mr. Cohen.
16	MR. COHEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Because I would
18	like to get on with the show here. So 29 is
19	basically received. It's identified and
20	received. Your motion is granted to, Mr.
21	Rose, receive it into evidence today subject
22	to voir dire/cross examination to validate the

1	chain of, I'm going to call it, the chain of
2	custody, but I'm sure there's a better word
3	than that. So that's my ruling. Let's move
4	onto 30. Maybe if we can finish 33 we can go
5	to lunch.
6	MR. COHEN: Thirty, Your Honor, is
7	a problematic document.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh boy.
9	MR. COHEN: Sorry to say that.
10	Let me put it in context.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
12	MR. COHEN: There is expert
13	testimony that, Your Honor, Wealth is going to
14	purport to or try to put in from a gentleman
15	named Mr. Kersey. Mr. Kersey is
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: How do you spell
17	
<i>+</i> '	his name?
18	his name? MR. COHEN: K-E-R-S-E-Y. Mr.
18	MR. COHEN: K-E-R-S-E-Y. Mr.
18 19	MR. COHEN: K-E-R-S-E-Y. Mr. Kersey has put a declaration in. It goes back

1	their website and they tabulated men, women
2	and age and Mr. Kersey gave us all the backup
3	for that. He looked at a couple of hundred
4	tabulations. He gave us the underlying forms.
5	We think there are lots of problems, but we'll
6	cross examine him about that.
7	This document was mentioned in Mr.
8	Kersey's deposition. It had never been
9	produced by WealthTV. It showed up in the
10	afternoon at the deposition and this purports
11	to be a tabulation that somebody named Mr.
12	Nickels did who is internal. If you turn to
13	the second page, it has information about men
14	and women.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait a minute.
16	Don't get to fast for me here. I'm on 30.
17	MR. COHEN: Thirty, the back page.
18	It's in color.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: I got the email and
20	then I got the thing in color.
21	MR. COHEN: Correct.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: The data.